



ATTACHMENT A Remarks

In response to the Office Action dated January 16, 2007, reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1 – 3, 5 – 8, 10 – 17, 19 – 22 and 25 is respectfully requested. Claim 9 has been canceled.

Claim Objections

Claim 9 has been objected to because the claim recites the term “may be.” In order to expedite the prosecution and to reduce the number of issues presented, Claim 9 has simply been canceled. As discussed below, it is believed that the remaining claims are in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1 – 3, 5 – 17 and 19 – 22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peng (U.S. Patent No. 6,738,766) in view of Moore et al (U.S. Patent No. 7,000,015) (“Moore”) and further in view of Dharmarajan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,979,063) (“Dharmarajan”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites a computer system for storing and retrieving data. The system comprises an identifier including three or more variables for identifying each data stored in the system, wherein, in accordance with an important feature of the claim, one of the three variables is filled by a wildcard used as an identifier and in setting default preferences.

It is admitted in the Office Action that, “Peng and Moore do not explicitly teach wherein one of the at least three variables is filled by a wildcard used as an identifier and in setting default preferences.” However, it is alleged that “Dharmarajan discloses wherein one of the at least three variables is filled by a wildcard used as an identifier and in setting default preferences” at “col. 7, lines 14 – 21 and 43 – 47.”

For convenience, the cited passages are repeated below:

According to an embodiment of the present invention, these configuration settings are determined based upon information provided with the request, or from information maintained in a registry of the Web server computer. So, for instance, the settings file 66A may contain configuration

settings 98A-98N prior to the parse of the global configuration file. Configuration settings may include HTTP_HOST, HOST_NAME, HOST_IP, and USER_USTORE configuration settings 98A-98N and their associated values. (col. 7, lines 13 – 22)

The rule "MISSING USER_DOMAIN AND HTTP_HOST=~.HOTMAIL.COM" is associated with the block "USER_DOMAIN" 90E. The "MISSING" command indicates that the element is true if the parameter is undefined. The "~" character is utilized as a wildcard placeholder.

It is not seen that these passages disclose the feature "wherein one of the at least three variables is filled by a wildcard used as an identifier and in setting default preferences" as recited in claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that these passages when considered in the context of the Dharmarajan reference merely disclose a "wildcard placeholder" used in parsing a global configuration file by testing rules associated with each block in the global configuration file to determine if they are satisfied (col. 7, lines 23 – 25). It is respectfully submitted that this teaching cannot be equated to an identifier including three or more variables for identifying each data stored in the system, wherein one of the three variables is filled by a wildcard used as an identifier and in setting default preferences, as recited in claim 1. Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection, and allowance of claim 1, and claims 2, 3, 5 – 8, 10, 21 and 22, which depend therefrom, is respectfully requested.

A related claim, independent claim 14, recites a method for storing and retrieving data in a computer system including a computer registry. The method includes: identifying each stored data in the computer system by an identifier including three or more variables, and filling one of the variables with a wildcard for enabling default settings to be set for (i) users not listed in the computer registry and (ii) for users listed in the registry but having no preferences.

The Office Action points to the same passages of Dharmarajan relied on as disclosing the wildcard used as an identifier and in setting default settings recited in claim 1. Additionally, the Office Action refers to col. 8, line 63 through col. 9, line 14.

For convenience, the additional passage is reproduced below:

From block 604, the Routine 600 continues to block 606, where "USER_USTORE" and "USER_DOMAIN"

configuration settings. The USER_USTORE configuration setting identifies a location that stores information corresponding to the user of a client computer making the request. For instance, the USER_USTORE configuration setting may identify the location of a particular database that maintains configuration information specific to the user. The USER_DOMAIN configuration setting identifies the domain to which the request is directed. According to an embodiment of the present invention, the USER_USTORE and USER_DOMAIN configuration settings are passed to the Web server computer as a portion of the requested URL. Those skilled in the art should appreciate that the USER_USTORE and USER_DOMAIN settings may be stored on the client computer making the request and passed to the Web server computer using a persistent client object, or cookie, or other method known to those skilled in the art.

Again, it is not seen that these passages disclose the limitations of claim 14. At best, the passages disclose: 1) a "wildcard placeholder" used in parsing a global configuration file by testing rules associated with each block in the global configuration file to determine if they are satisfied, as discussed above; and 2) retrieving configuration settings specific to a user. It is respectfully submitted that the disclosure of a "wildcard placeholder" used in rule testing, and retrieving configuration settings specific to a user is not a teaching or suggestion of the step of filling a variable with a wildcard for enabling default settings to be set for (i) users not listed in the computer registry and (ii) for users listed in the registry but having no preferences, all as recited in claim 14. Thus, the cited art does not appear to support the rejection of claim 14, and allowance of the claim is proper. Further, the allowance of claims 15 – 17 and 19 – 20, which depend from claim 14, is also appropriate for at least this reason.

In addition, it is respectfully submitted that claim 19 is separately patentable over the cited references. Claim 19 recites "the method according to claim 18, further including the step of deleting one or more data items that has been superseded by a subsequent data having same identifier but a higher time stamp value."

It is alleged in the Office Action that "Peng teaches deleting one or more data items that has been supersede by a subsequent data having same identifier but a higher time stamp value" in Fig. 8, element 810. Element 810 of Fig. 8 is a step that

states "Remove the Posted Application Selection Records from the Mobile Application Selection Table."

It is respectfully submitted that nowhere in Fig. 8 are time stamp values mentioned, and, therefore, Fig. 8 does not teach or suggest deleting one or more data items that has been superseded by a subsequent data having same identifier but a higher time stamp value, as recited in claim 19. Thus, claim 19 is allowable independently of the allowability of its parent independent claim, claim 14.

Turning now to independent claim 11, claim 11 recites:

11. A computer registry for storing and retrieving preference data, comprising:

an identifier including at least three variables for identifying data stored in said computer registry, wherein one of said at least three or more variables is a physical location variable relating to a physical location other than in a computer, and wherein the data stored in said computer registry includes preference data comprising a combination of an identifier and a value.

The Office Action indicates that, "Claim 11 is rejected by the same rationale as state in independent claim 1 arguments."

It is respectfully submitted that the same rationale does not apply in that independent claim 11 and independent claim 1 are directed to distinctly different subject matter. For instance, claim 11 recites "data stored in a computer registry including preference data comprising a combination of an identifier and a value." Claim 1 has no equivalent limitation, and the rejection of claim 1 does not address such a limitation. Moreover, the passages of the references cited against claim 1 have been reviewed, but do not appear to teach or suggest the computer registry as recited in claim 11. Thus, allowance of claim 11, as well as claims 12 – 13 and 25 which depend therefrom, is respectfully requested.

Lastly, it is respectfully submitted that dependent claim 25 is further and separately allowable because it is non-obvious in view of prior art cited in the Office Action. Claim 25 recites "means for deleting one or more data items that has been superseded by a subsequent data having a same identifier but a higher time stamp value."

The Office Action rejects claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peng in view of Moore in view of Dharmarajan and further in view of Guturu (U.S. Patent 6,581,075). It is admitted that Peng, Moore and Dharmarajan do not explicitly teach means for deleting one or more data items that has been superseded by a subsequent data having the same identifier, but a higher time stamp value. The Office Action then refers to Guturu as teaching the missing element.

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Peng, Moore, Dharmarajan and Guturu is the improper product of hindsight, and that the need to rely on four different references to meet the limitations of claim 25 is constructive proof of the non-obviousness of the subject matter recited therein.

The motivation given for the combination of Guturu with Peng, Moore and Dharmarajan is that "because it would provide the system to resolve the conflict arising from problem of replacement updated." It is respectfully submitted that this very general statement, insofar as clear, is not a proper motivation for combining the references. Thus, claim 25 is further and separately allowable.

Allowance of the application in its present form is respectfully solicited.

END REMARKS